

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 - 33 are pending in this application, with claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 18, 23, 28, 30 and 32 being independent claims. In the office action that was sent August 20, 2008, claims 1-15, 17-20, 22-25 and 27-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Reznick (US Published Application 2003/0014539), and claims 16, 21 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Reznick in view of Official Notice.

Paraphrased, the amended claims are directed to embedding a link into an email and sending the email to a recipient. When the recipient selects the link, link attributes are sent to a redirect server, where the redirect server matches a universal resource locator with the link attributes. The universal resource locator is then sent to the recipient, and upon receiving the universal resource locator, retrieves the content from the web site associated with the universal resource locator.

Support for the amendments made to the independent claims can found at least in Figures 6 and 7, elements 610, 612, 614, 704 and 706. No new matter has been added.

In the outstanding office action, the Examiner set forth, in pertinent part, that Reznick, teaches “sending the universal resource locator from the redirect server to the recipient”. In particular the Examiner stated that because Reznick teaches redirecting the user to the destination website (#118 redirection web page), that it was “*inherent* that once the redirection occurs that the user is sent the link [to the website] and the webpage (#118 redirection web page) displays the appropriate contents from the URL received from the redirect server #106” (office action, page 4, last paragraph). Applicants respectfully traverse this assertion.

Reznick discloses a system and method for tracking and managing web site user traffic through the use of special codes embedded in URLs. The embedded URL is selected by a user, and connected to a redirection server, where the special codes are analyzed and the

redirection associated with the received code is carried out” (Reznick [0027]). The embedded codes disclosed in Reznick are the heart of the invention, as the codes indicate various information beneficial to the monitoring of the traffic to a web site, such as “the economics involved in obtaining the traffic (including cost and cost type, the manner in which the user is to be redirect to a destination site, and the valid destinations sites” (Reznick [0027]). As such, if the URL of the destination was sent to the user, and the user directly accessed the web site via the URL, Reznick would be, in essence, rendered inoperable. Through the direct access of the web site from the URL, there are no codes embedded in the URL, the redirection server would be bypassed, and the traffic monitoring through the use of the embedded codes in the original URL would not occur. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Reznick does not inherently teach sending the URL to the recipient, with the recipient using the URL to directly web site.

As each and every element of the present invention are not disclosed directly or inherently, Applicants respectfully contend that the amended claims as now presented traverse the rejections and place the claims in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert H.Kelly/

Robert H. Kelly
Registration No. 33,922

KELLY & KRAUSE, L.P.
6600 LBJ Freeway, Suite 275
Dallas, Texas 75240
Telephone: (214) 446-6684
Fax: (214) 446-6692
robert.kelly@kelly-krause.com